

### RESPONSE AND REMARKS

Amendments to original Claims 7 and 10 through 14 are filed concurrently herewith to more distinctly claim the invention. New Claims 23 - 26 are also filed herewith. Entry of the amendments and the new claims, and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner formally confirmed a restriction requirement, construing Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 15-22 as Group I, and Claims 7 and 10-14 as Group II.

Pursuant to the formal restriction requirement dated April 5, 2004 and in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.142, Applicant formally confirms election of, and hereby formally elects, for further examination the invention construed by the Examiner as Group II described by the Examiner as Claims 7, and Claims 10-14; Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 15-22 corresponding to non-elected Group I, are withdrawn from examination without prejudice to Applicant's filing in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 121 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.142, during the pendency of the present Application, a divisional application directed to non-elected Group I construed by the Examiner as Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 15-22.

### SPECIFICATION

In the Office action, the Examiner objected to use of various trademarks as used in the specification and indicated that the trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear. Responsive to the Examiner's objections to the use of trademarks, the specification, as amended, identifies trademarks used in the specification, references the proprietary nature of those trademarks through the use of the "TM" symbol, and equates the TM-designated trademark with both an all-capitalized version of the trademark and with alternative ways in which the trademarks appear in the specification.

### SECTION 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7, 11, 13, and 14 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112 on several grounds. Amendments to the

rejected claims more distinctly claim the invention; it is respectfully submitted that the amendments resolve the Examiner's objections.

SECTION 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Brandien et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,561; "Brandien"). In rejecting Claim 7, the Examiner stated that "Brandien discloses the use of a shipping management system usable within a company that generates a barcode tracking label . . ." (citing the abstract of *Brandien* and *Brandien*, Col. 4, lines 1-7).

Brandien discloses a "system for tracking the receipt and internal delivery of items such as packages." Brandien, Title.

As distinguished from a system, such as disclosed in Brandien, for tracking the receipt and internal delivery of a package, the claims, as amended, of the present application, are directed to shipping, and more specifically, to a shipping management computer system. Further, as distinguished from a system that merely provides for a single user to request shipping of a parcel, independent Claim 7 of the present application, as amended, is directed to "recognize as a pre-processing traveler label request, a shipping request by a first particular user within an enterprise . . . and recognize a completion of the shipping request according to input by a second user within the enterprise."

It is respectfully submitted that Brandien does not disclose, anticipate or suggest a system, such as claimed by Claim 7 of the present application, that is directed to recognizing as a pre-processing traveler label request, a shipping request by a first particular user within an enterprise and recognizing a completion of the shipping request according to input by a second user within the enterprise. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 7 of the present application, as amended, is patentably distinct from Brandien.

Claim 10 of the present application is directed to "generat[ing] a shipping document . . . compris[ing] content . . . according to a shipping privilege setting for the user . . .".

It is respectfully submitted that Brandien does not disclose, anticipate or suggest a system, such as claimed by Claim 10 of the present application, that is directed to generating a shipping document comprising content according to a shipping privilege setting for the user.

SECTION 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandien in view of Rabne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,332; "Rabne").

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner stated that: "Brandien . . . teaches the use of an internal shipping system . . ." Office Action, page 5, topic number 18. The Examiner conceded that Brandien "fails to disclose restricting users within the enterprise from printing shipping labels . . ." but concluded that "Rabne . . . discloses a rights management system for digital media that allows an administrator to set rights for a user to restrict printing certain items." Office Action, page 5, topic number 18 (citing Rabne, Col. 21, lines 8-33).

As distinguished from Brandien, whether considered alone or in combination with Rabne, or with any other reference of record, independent Claim 10, as amended, is directed to "generat[ing] a shipping document for the user, wherein said shipping document comprises content, wherein the content of the shipping document is generated according to a shipping privilege setting for the user." That is, as compared to the Examiner's reading of Rabne "set[ting] rights for a user to restrict printing certain items", independent Claim 10, as amended, is directed to generating a shipping document comprising content according to a shipping privilege setting for the user.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest generating a shipping document comprising content according to a shipping privilege setting for the user. Accordingly, it is

respectfully submitted that neither Brandien nor Rabne, whether considered alone or in combination with any other reference of record, disclose, anticipate, or suggest the subject matter of Claim 10, as amended, of the present application.

For the foregoing reasons and authorities, because independent Claims 7 and 10 are patentable over the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that new dependent Claims 23 - 26, and dependent Claims 11-14, as amended, are therefore also patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments, and for the foregoing reasons and authorities, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention disclosed and claimed in the present amended application is not fairly taught by any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the amended application.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marilyn R. Khorsandi  
Reg. No. 45,744  
626/796-2856